

Appl. No. 10/758,065  
Docket No. 9149Q  
Amdt. dated April 9, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed on October 9, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

### Rejection Under 35 USC §102 Over Huen, Gergek and West

Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15, 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huen '140 for reasons of record at paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated October 9, 2007.

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 13-18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gergek '405 for reasons of record at paragraph 4 of the Office Action dated October 9, 2007.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by West '993 for reasons of record at paragraph 5 of the Office Action dated October 9, 2007.

Applicants traverse the above rejections in view of the following remarks. Applicants respectfully remind the Office that independent claims 1, 7 and 15 were previously amended to include the features of a product in sheet form that comprises a substrate that releasably carries a composition of matter. The rejections stated in paragraphs 3-5 of the Office Action dated October 9, 2007, do not demonstrate or at least indicate that Huen '140, Gergek '405 or West '993 disclose the feature of a product in a sheet form that comprises a substrate that releasably carries a composition of matter. Absent a clear showing that any of these references discloses a product in a sheet form that comprises a substrate that releasably carries a composition of matter, it is Applicants' position that the rejections stated in paragraphs 3-5 of the Office Action dated October 9, 2007, are improper.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/758,065  
Docket No. 9149Q  
Amdt. dated April 9, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed on October 9, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Washington in view of Winkler

Claim 1, 5-6, 15-16, and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Washington '634 in view of Winkler '230. The rejection stated in paragraph 8 of the Office Action dated October 9, 2007, does not demonstrate or at least indicate that Washington '634 considered alone or in combination with Winkler '230 discloses the feature of a product in a sheet form that comprises a substrate that releasably carries a composition of matter. Absent a clear showing that any of these references discloses a product in a sheet form that comprises a substrate that releasably carries a composition of matter, it is Applicants' position that the rejections stated in paragraph 8 of the Office Action dated October 9, 2007, has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness..


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied reference(s). In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the pending claim(s) are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By   
Thibault Fayette  
Registration No. 56,143  
(513) 634-7758

Date: April 9, 2008  
Customer No. 27752  
(Amendment-Response to Office Action.doc)  
Revised 11/17/2006